

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 4-9, 14-23, 25-27, 29-30 and 34-37 are currently pending
- Claims 38-42 are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 27 and 30 are amended herein

[0003] Claims 1, 27 and 30 are amended to include subject matter from dependent claims 37-42. In addition, claims 1, 27 and 30 are amended herein to clarify that the visual indicator of the mark comprises visual display properties that convey a plurality of characteristics of the mark, "wherein the plurality of characteristics of the mark are displayed." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 26, line 24 through page 27, line 5.

Claim Objections

[0004] Claims 39-42 stand objected to as allegedly failing to further narrow the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's objection of these claims, but in an attempt to more speedily advance prosecution, Applicant has canceled these claims. The cancelation of these dependent claims thus renders the objection moot.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Novak: Novak et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0126599
- Gatto: Gatto et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,346,917
- Vasilevsky: Vasilevsky, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0166258
- Vallone: Vallone, U.S. Patent No. 6,642,939
- Lu: Lu et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,647,548
- Carver: Carver et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,451,467
- Khan: Khan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,460,038

Claims 1, 4-6, 14-23, 25-27, 29-30, 34-36 and 38-41 Are Non-Obvious Over Novak, Gatto and in further view of Vasilevsky

[0006] Claims 1, 4-6, 14-23, 25-27, 29-30, 34-36 and 38-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Novak, Gatto and in further view of Vasilevsky. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0007] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky. Applicant submits that the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky

does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A method for presenting information, the method comprising:

- presenting the information using a first processing mechanism;
- while presenting the information using the first processing mechanism, receiving a user-submitted command;

- in response to the user-submitted command, adding a mark that is associated with the information, using a marking mechanism of the first processing mechanism; transferring the information from the first processing mechanism to a second processing mechanism, the second processing mechanism being physically distinct from the first processing mechanism; and

- presenting the information using the second processing mechanism based on the mark added using the first processing mechanism,

- wherein at least one of said adding the mark and said presenting the information using the second processing mechanism comprises displaying a visual indicator of the mark at a display position that is related to a time at which the mark was associated with the information, **wherein the visual indicator of the mark comprises visual display properties that conveys a plurality of characteristics of the mark**, wherein the **plurality of characteristics of the mark are displayed**, the characteristics of the mark comprising:

- a time when the mark was created;
 - a date when the mark was created;
 - an indication of a processing mechanism through which the mark was created;
 - an indication of a physical location at which the mark was created;
 - an indication of a processing mechanism that is permitted to later invoke the mark; and

an expiration time associated with the mark.

[0008] Claim 1 recites in part, “wherein the visual indicator of the mark comprises visual display properties that conveys a plurality of characteristics of the mark” and that “the plurality of characteristics of the mark are displayed.” The Office cites Vasilevsky, paragraph [0057] and Figure 6 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 6.) Vasilevsky describes a text box that includes such information as the “bookmark establisher’s name, a title of the bookmark and a brief description of what occurred in the program just prior to the pause point.”

[0009] Vasilevsky does not teach the additional characteristics presently claimed that are displayed, namely the inclusion of a date and time when the mark was created, an indication of a processing mechanism via which the mark was created, an indication of a physical location via which the mark was created, an indication of a processing mechanism that is permitted to later invoke the mark and an expiration time associated with the mark. Nor does the inclusion of Novak and Gatto does not rectify this deficiency.

[0010] Consequently, the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26

[0011] Claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their

dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 27

[0012] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 27 as amended is obvious in view of the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky. Applicant submits that the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

27. (Currently Amended) A method for presenting information, comprising:

receiving instructions generated in response to the activation of a marking mechanism during the display of a first program;

displaying a mark panel display in response to the instructions, wherein the mark panel display comprises:

a selectable command to create a mark associated with the first program, wherein the mark comprises a visual indicator of the mark at a display position that is related to a time at which the mark is associated with information, wherein **the visual indicator of the mark comprises visual display properties that conveys a plurality of characteristics of the mark, wherein the plurality of characteristics of the mark is displayed, the characteristics of the mark consisting of:**

a time when the mark was created;

a date when the mark was created;

an indication of a processing mechanism through which the mark was created;

an indication of a physical location at which the mark was created;

an indication of a processing mechanism that is permitted to later invoke the mark; and

an expiration time associated with the mark; and
a representation of a second program, wherein:
the second program is different from the first program; and
the second program has an associated mark;
receiving a user's input via the mark panel display; and
in response to the user's input:

in an event that the user's input corresponds to the selectable
command to create a mark associated with the first program, creating a
new mark in the first program; and

in an event that the user's input corresponds to the representation
of the second program, invoking the mark associated with the second
program.

[0013] Claim 27 recites in part, "wherein the visual indicator of the mark comprises visual display properties that conveys a plurality of characteristics of the mark" and that "the plurality of characteristics of the mark is displayed." The Office cites Vasilevsky, paragraph [0057] and Figure 6 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 6.) Vasilevsky describes a text box that includes such information as the "bookmark establisher's name, a title of the bookmark and a brief description of what occurred in the program just prior to the pause point."

[0014] Vasilevsky does not teach the additional characteristics presently claimed that are displayed consists of a date and time when the mark was created, an indication of a processing mechanism via which the mark was created, an indication of a physical location via which the mark was created, an indication of a processing mechanism that is permitted to later invoke the mark and an expiration time associated with the mark. Nor does the inclusion of Novak and Gatto does not rectify this deficiency.

[0015] Consequently, the combination of Novak, Gatto and Vasilevsky does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26

[0016] Claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 4-9, 14-23, 25 and 26 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent claim 30 and dependent claims 34-37

[0017] Applicant respectfully contends that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, as amended, applies with equal weight here and the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of independent claim 30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of this claim. Further, dependent claims 34-37 are allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 30 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 34-37.

Conclusion

[0018] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to

contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. No. 59,090/ Dated: 2009-10-06
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090